COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

M E M O

LONG RANGE PLANNING

TO: Plan Review Steering Committee

FROM: Long Range Planning Staff

DATE: May 21, 2003

SUBJECT: Summary Notes from the GMA Steering Committee meeting of

May 21, 2003 (Meeting #34)

Attendance:

Steering Committee Members:

Elizabeth Cerveny

Jeanne Harris

City of La Center Council Member

City of Vancouver Council Member

City of Ridgefield Council Member

John Idsinga City of Battle Ground Mayor

Craig Pridemore Clark County Board of Commissioners (Chair)

Debbie Smith Town of Yacolt Council Member

Judie Stanton Clark County Board of Commissioners
Jeannie Steward City of Vancouver Council Member

Public:

Marnie Allen Consortium of Clark County Schools Michelle Cotner Felida Neighborhood Association

Lynda David RTC

Jessica Hoffman Clark County Association of Realtors

James Howsley Lane Powell Spears Lubersky

Steve Horenstein MillerNash Law Firm

James Jelly Evergreen East Neighborhood Association
Carol Jelly Evergreen East Neighborhood Association

Dean Lookingbill RTC
John McConnaughey WSDOT

Chuck Milbrandt Landowners Representative

Jeff Mize The Columbian

William Moyer Pleasant Hills Neighborhood Association

Ken Navidi Hazel Dell Sewer District

Ron Price Pleasant Hills Neighborhood Association

Randy Printz Landerholm Law Firm Steve Stuart Friends of Clark County

Bud Van Cleve NE Hazel Dell Neighborhood Assocation

George Vartanian Self & Fairgrounds Neighborhood Association

Staff:

Jose Alvarez Clark County Long Range Planning Monty Anderson City of Washougal Planning Director

Rich Carson Clark County Community Development Director

Derek Chisholm Clark County Long Range Planning

Richard Cyr Clark Public Utilities

Eric Eisemann Cities of La Center & Ridgefield
Bob Higbie Clark County Long Range Planning

Mary Keltz Clark County Board of Commissioner's Office Patrick Lee Clark County Long Range Planning Manager

Rich Lowry Clark County Chief Civil Deputy Prosecuting Attorney

Dale Miller C-TRAN

Oliver Orjiako Clark County Long Range Planning

Dennis Osburn

Marty Snell

Bryan Snodgrass

Suzan Wallace

City of Battle Ground

City of Camas Planning

City of Vancouver Planning

City of Vancouver Planning

Josh Warner Clark County Community Development

1. Introductions

Pridemore called the meeting to order. Everyone present introduced themselves.

2. Review April 16, 2003 meeting notes

Corrections: Laura Hudson is now Planning Director for the City of Vancouver and Gillian Zacharias is with Dean Evans & Associates, not David Evans & Associates.

3. Review of Comprehensive Plan Timeline

Lee reviewed the revised calendar that was made available to everyone present. Principal changes included moving the BOCC hearing date for selecting a preferred alternative from June 24 to June 23, 2003, 10:00 AM to 2:00 PM in the PSC sixth floor hearing room and adding a third public open house opportunity for people to review the preferred alternative and ask questions. The public open houses were rescheduled to August 7, 13, and 19.

4. Review of County Staff prepared matrix assessing planning alternatives

The criteria were reviewed by Alvarez from a handout dated April 24, 2003. The various alternatives are 'rated' on the second page of the memo and the criteria 'ratings' are subsequently explained. Pridemore pointed out that alt 3 is better than alt 5 in economic development, why? Alvarez said the alt 5 came in second on many of the categories. Lee

stated that the criteria are at a very gross scale and can be impacted by different inputs. The measure may still be subjective. Hefflin asked if a correlation has been made with the criteria in the comp plan. Lee responds that the policies are laid out in the criteria. Pridemore suggested that comments can be formulated and sent in later. Higbie said copies will be sent out via e-mail.

5. Brief presentations by each city (about 5 minutes) about comments on Draft EIS and reasons for recommendations (each city)

EIS comments have been received from all of the cities. Each city had a chance to present them.

Idsinga presented for Battle Ground. A handout from the city describes the details. They find that alternative (alt) 4 is the best alternative. They need jobs with the housing they are currently building. Pridemore asked about growth rate. Idsinga said they need land for jobs. Lee stated that staff tried to map the comments as they came in on a map that is available. Pridemore stated that they are trying to draw distinctions between the cities and using riparian zones to draw the distinction. Does the city need to straddle Salmon Creek? Idsinga said they might not need to go over Salmon Creek. The 50 - year plan shows going north of the East Fork Lewis River. He wants to protect the East Fork. If Salmon Creek is in the city it would be on sewer and not septic. Idsing a would be happy going to the bluff on the north side of Salmon Creek. Any additions that need to be made would be preferred to the west. Stanton asked about an annexation strategy. Idsinga said they are not pushing for annexation, but if people ask they will review ideas. Stanton reiterated that it needs to be done in an orderly fashion. She also asked what if the jobs don't come. Idsing said they will rely on zoning to protect the lands for jobs. As far as a CFP they are working with different providers to make it happen. A new reservoir is under construction. A Parks bond measure has been referred to voters. Battle Ground is discussing the extensions of sewer service with both Hazel Dell Sewer District and the City of Vancouver. Osborn said the annexation strategy is on the radar screen. They are waiting for other planning to take place. They can show a CFP to fund the infrastructure needs.

Snell presented for Camas and reviewed a letter already submitted. Three themes were presented. 1) Responsible growth: they like alts 2 and 4. 2) Strategic Economic Development: They have worked hard and do not like alts 1 and 5. Need to stay within CFP limits. City would like to see city specific urban reserves. 3) Community Livability: Would like a balancing of GMA goals. Camas has presented a boundary expansion request. It includes Fisher Swale and north of Lacamas Lake. Two existing subdivisions could be annexed if they were put into the Camas UGB. Pridemore asked about converting residential to industrial. Is alt 4 sufficient to not do more of these conversions? Snell responded that some properties, including the Dwyer Creek Area, may be multifamily/mixed-use areas. Some tertiary industrial lands will also be looked at for potential conversion. They are working on 75/25 with 6 du/acre plan. Stanton asked about the new high school that was mentioned. Snell responded this would simply incorporate the existing school into the city not build a new one. The conversation is still open as far as Snell is concerned over Fisher Swale with the City of Vancouver. There are specific

geographic areas of interest that they have outlined been identified by each city, including preferred land uses.

E. Cerveny presented for La Center. She reviewed the letter that was previously submitted to the county. They prefer to add about 64 acres as generally depicted in alt 4 along North Fork Road for low density residential use with some changes. They do not want more area in their UGA at this time. However, they are suggesting some designation of urban reserve near the La Center/Timmens Road intersection for future commercial use and wish to extend urban reserve designations at the I-5 junction. Planning related to the La Center Junction area is of great interest to the city for potential future industrial use. They would like to engage the County and other interests in developing a subarea plan for that area in order to capitalize on the Discovery Corridor concept and protect future options for the City's economic security. Cyr of Clark Public Utilities talked about the La Center sewer plant expansion. The expansion is out for bid now and will double capacity. That should accommodate growth through 2013 and enable future expansion at that time.

Hefflin presented for Ridgefield. They are now requesting some UGA expansion. The completion of the sewage treatment plant and other infrastructure has helped this need along City to reconsider their prior position (no expansion). They have also been influenced by the idea of the Discovery Corridor. Some About 50 acres of land south of Hillhurst Rd would be brought into the UGA for a new high school, and some About 30 acres of Port-owned lands near the I-5 Junction and now designated urban reserve would be brought into the UGA for industrial use. The Boschma, Warner, and McNair properties east of Ridgefield Junction and the Roher and Walker properties east of NE 10th Ave. would be designated industrial reserve. About 30 acres of land southwest of the intersection of SR 501 and 45th is proposed to be brought into the UGA to develop a church, church school and business park. Four acres of land around the intersection of S 5th St and NE 10th Ave. is suggested for commercial use and 3 ½ acres along the extension of Pioneer St. for right of way and stormwater uses. The City, like La Center, would like to engage the County and other interests in developing a sub-area plan for that area in order to capitalize on the Discovery Corridor concept and protect future options for the City's economic security... More than half the land requested by Ridgefield is in areas proposed for Focused Public Investment. Alt 4 is closest to what the city would like to see. They would like more reserves to prevent parcelization. Pridemore responded that the county is not promoting parcelization with the current zoning. Hefflin said some existing parcels are small. They just want to maintain the existing parcel sizes. Eisemann said a new zone for reserve may be needed. They have 600 acres existing and are asking for 300+ without urban reserves. Transportation modeling is taking place currently to find out where they stand. They are not expecting a 269th Street interchange, but foresee some improvements in the area. The bridge will need to be widened. There is no new freeway access proposed. The 300+ request has been accounted for in the transportation infrastructure. Bridge expansion will happen regardless of the expansion. If land brought in as industrial it might be mixed use and housing would all be multi-family. Pridemore is more concerned with big box retail.

Harris presented for Vancouver. Her three themes were 1) Responsible Growth, 2) Strategic Economic Growth, and 3) Livability. They initially refer alt 4, but there are

financial considerations. They have water and sewer capacity, but transportation is an issue. What is feasible for the city to do as far as infrastructure? Annexation law has presented some problems. The creation of jobs is a priority. That is why they would ask for growth. They are looking at feasible and efficient areas that are affordable. 'Alt 3a' is something between alts 3 and 4. It is a hybrid. They want urban reserve in adjoining areas originally proposed to be brought into the UGA in alt 4. They would prefer the area NW of the city as urban reserve. They also want expansion on the east side which is currently agricultural. They want a strategy of how the area can be maintained in agriculture and large parcels for the time being in large parcels. They want to expand to the SE in Fisher Swale. They have negotiated with Camas and they have not yet come to a compromise. They have infrastructure to serve the area. They do not agree with the Discovery Corridor, alt 5, idea because there are areas within existing UGBs available. Idsing asked the size of Fisher Swale? It is not clear the exact area. They want Urban Reserve in WNE. Pridemore asked about the urban reserve lands that they might be prime agricultural lands now. Harris responded that it is not currently feasible to provide infrastructure. Lee asked about the land uses in the Fisher Swale area. Wallace responded that Vancouver and Camas staff came to and understanding about most some uses such and including wetland banking and some other employment uses. The general land uses can be agreed upon. Snell concurred. Wallace said there are some concerns with the current proposal by Camas, especially some multi-family designations that were different than those designations discussed in the Fisher Swale negotiations.

Anderson presented for Washougal. Lou Peterson was not able to be here to review the comments presented by the city. Anderson reviewed a letter. Some internal changes have recently taken place to increase some densities. People have expressed an interest in preserving a compact city form. More work is needed on the CFP. Parks lands are available, but they need to be developed, especially youth sports fields. The recent expansion to the sewage treatment plan provides sufficient capacity to accommodate growth. A new reservoir has been built to provide fire flows for the Northeast areas of the city... They are also interested in forming a stormwater utility. They prefer alts 3 and 4. In June they plan to forward draft CFP to the county for review.

Smith presented for Yacolt. She summarized a handout that was available and sent to the county. They feel the Yacolt plan is in compliance with any of the alternatives, but some preference is given to alts 3 and 4. No changes to the Yacolt UGA are proposed until the sewer issue is resolved. But some growth can be accommodated on 18,000+ sq. ft. lots in the meantime.

Idsinga commented about transportation. He expressed a need for a corridor or beltway. He wants some sort of reserved corridor for this purpose. Harris reemphasized what kind of county we want: rural and urban or just urban? We need to do something now. Pridemore stated that a shortcoming of GMA is that there is no long-term vision. Stanton responded that there is no money to acquire right-of-way at this time for any future roads.

6. TAC update

Meeting next week. Continue discussion of the criteria matrix.

7. Next meeting date and time

June 18th is the next meeting on the schedule.

8. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 5:40

h:\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\cpt 99-003 - steering committee\minutes - steering\steering committee - May 21 2003 (#34).doc

SUMMARY NOTES - STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

JPW